

Assignment Marking Criteria

Literature Review = 15 marks total						
	0	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Intro to topic 5 marks	No intro (no title and no content) or minimal intro (a heading with no content). No definition of key terms.	Minimal intro (a heading with no content). Minimal definition of key terms (completely inaccurate or almost completely inaccurate definitions used).	Vague or unclear intro (content of introduction not matching title or introduction not addressing core concepts). Key terms somewhat poorly defined (overuse of quotes and frequent errors in definitions).	Vague or unclear intro (content of introduction not matching title or introduction not addressing core concepts). Key terms defined well (no overuse of quotes and infrequent errors in definitions).	Clear intro (content of introduction matches title and Introduction addresses core concepts). Key terms defined well (no overuse of quotes, infrequent errors in definitions).	Clear and concise intro (content of introduction matches the title and core concepts are addressed consistently). Key terms described excellently (no use of quotes and minimal errors in definitions).
(2) Qualit y of Review 5 marks	Literature not evaluated (section is absent). Section is completely irrelevant (does not relate to core concepts and key terms). Only statements of opinion/belief. No synthesis of literature (different studies never discussed in conjunction). No references.	Frequent statements of opinion/beliefs. No synthesis of literature (different studies never discussed in conjunction). Minimal references. Poor quality of references (biased), narrow choice of references (only refers to the textbook), and consistent inappropriate references (Wikipedia or similar) and consistent faulty interpretation.	Literature minimally evaluated. Section is completely irrelevant (does not relate to core concepts and key terms). Frequent statements of opinion/beliefs. No synthesis of literature (different studies never discussed in conjunction). Minimal references. Poor quality of reference (biased), narrow choice of references (only refers the textbook), and frequent inappropriate references (Wikipedia or similar) and frequent misinterpretations.	Literature moderately evaluated. Section is somewhat relevant (relates to over half of key terms and concepts). Minimal statements of opinion/beliefs. Rare synthesis of literature (different studies are rarely discussed in conjunction). Adequate references. Acceptable quality of references (little bias), frequent narrow choice of references (frequently refers to the textbook), no inappropriate references and occasional misinterpretations.	Literature highly evaluated. Section is largely relevant (relates to all key terms and concepts). Minimal statements of opinion/belief. Rare synthesis of literature (different studies are rarely discussed in conjunction). Adequate references. Acceptable quality of references (little bias), frequent broad choice of references (infrequently refers to textbook), no inappropriate references and rare misinterpretations of literature.	Literature comprehensively evaluated. Section is largely relevant (relates to all key terms and concepts). No statements of opinion/belief. Frequent synthesis of literature (different studies are discussed in conjunction more often than not). Adequate references. Acceptable quality of references (little bias), consistent broad choice of references (infrequently refers to textbook), no inappropriate references and no faulty interpretation of references.
(3) Struct ure 5 marks	No evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. No logic (sentences never connect, paragraphs never connect). No relevant or information provided.	Minimal evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. Minimal logic (sentences and paragraphs connect and flow minimally). Mostly no relevant information provided. Abstract included with largely insufficient detail and clarity.	Minimal evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. Minimal logic (sentences and paragraphs connect and flow minimally). Some relevant information provided. Abstract included with insufficient detail and clarity.	Moderate evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. Frequent logic (sentences and paragraphs connect and flow frequently). Mostly relevant information provided. Abstract included with some detail and clarity.	High evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. Frequent logic (sentences and paragraphs connect consistently with rare exceptions). Mostly relevant information provided. Abstract included with sufficient clarity, brevity, and detail.	High evidence of adherence to structure as outlined in assignment 2 course documents. Frequent logic (sentences and paragraphs connect consistently with rare exceptions). Mostly relevant information provided. Abstract included with sufficient clarity, brevity, and detail.

	Abstract not included.					
--	------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Integration = 20 marks total						
	0	3-4	5-6	7-10	11-15	16-20
(4) Pre-post assessment & intervention 20 marks	Section not included or section minimally included. Does not include assessment scores. No assessment tool included. Does not integrate findings with references to literature (not included reasoning about findings being consistent or inconsistent with literature).	Section minimally included (important parts missing). Omits pre or post scores. Intervention not adequately detailed (the steps of the intervention and actions taken are not outlined). Vague description of assessment tool. Unclear which intervention chosen (does not commit to one intervention – evidence of mixing and matching or major deviation). Inappropriate assessment tool used (assessment does not measure the concept). Does not integrate findings with references to literature (not included reasoning about findings being consistent or inconsistent with literature).	Section partially included (some parts may be missing). Omits pre or post scores. Intervention not adequately detailed (the steps of the intervention and actions taken are not outlined). Vague description of assessment tool. Unclear which intervention chosen (does not commit to one intervention – evidence of mixing and matching or major deviation). Inappropriate assessment tool used (assessment does not measure the concept). Does not integrate findings with references to literature (not included reasoning about findings being consistent or	Section mostly included (no major parts missing). Omits some elements of pre or post scores. Intervention not adequately detailed (the steps of the intervention and actions to be taken are not outlined). Clear description of assessment tool. Clear which intervention chosen. Appropriate assessment tool used (assessment measures the concept). Does not integrate findings with references to literature (not included reasoning about findings being consistent or inconsistent with literature).	Section fully included (no parts missing). Does not omit any scores. Intervention not adequately detailed however (the steps of the intervention and actions to be taken are not fully outlined). Clear description of assessment tool. Clear which intervention chosen (commits to an intervention). Appropriate assessment tool used (assessment measures the concept). Does integrate findings with references to literature (included reasoning about findings being consistent or inconsistent with literature).	Section fully included (no parts missing). Does not omit any scores. Intervention is fully detailed (the steps of the intervention and actions to be taken are outlined). Clear description of assessment tool. Clear which intervention chosen (commits to an intervention). Appropriate assessment tool used (assessment measures the concept). Does integrate findings with references to literature (included reasoning about findings being consistent or inconsistent with literature).

			inconsistent with literature).			
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

Application = 5 marks				
	0	1	2-3	4-5
(5) Application 5 marks	(5) Section not included. No strategy chosen.	Section included. Inappropriate strategy chosen (not based on literature). Strategy is vague/overly general.	Section included. Appropriate strategy is chosen (based on literature). Strategy is vague/overly general – marker should consider a 2 or 3 point-based degree of clarity.	Section included. Appropriate strategy is chosen (reasonable justification based on literature should lead to a higher score award). Strategy is clearly & succinctly described.

Summary / Discussion = 5 marks total						
	0	1	2	3	4	5
(6) Discussion 5 marks	Discussion not included. No Empirical literature referred to.	Discussion included. Vague or overly general discussion, which misses more than one area. No Empirical literature referred to.	Discussion included. Vague or overly general discussion, which misses more than one area. Empirical literature referred to.	Discussion included. Vague or overly general discussion, which misses more than one area. Empirical literature referred to.	Discussion included. Clear discussion with rare vague and overly general statements, which does not miss more than one area. Empirical literature referred to.	Discussion included. Clear discussion with no vague or overly general statements. Does not miss more than one area. Empirical literature referred to.

APA & Written Expression = 5 marks

	0-1	2-3	4-5
(7) APA-7 5 marks	(7) No or minimal in-text referencing or reference list. Written expression is poor rendering assignment difficult to read. APA-7 formatting infrequent.	In-text citations and referencing appropriate to content. APA-7 formatting used with frequent errors. Written expression lacks clarity or logic.	APA-7 formatting consistently adhered to, with minimal errors. Written expression is excellent with infrequent typographical and grammatical errors.